Value Structure at an Early Age

Maike Bubeck and Wolfgang Bilsky

2002

Berichte aus dem Psychologischen Institut IV

Sozialpsychologie ♦ Persönlichkeitspsychologie ♦ Organisationspsychologie

Fliednerstr. 21, 48149 Münster

Die Reihe erscheint von 1986 an in unregelmäßiger Reihenfolge und enthält Forschungsberichte und theoretische Arbeiten von Angehörigen des Psychologischen Instituts IV der WWU, Sozialpsychologie, Persönlichkeitspsychologie, Organisationspsychologie. Das Copyright für Arbeiten, die in einem anderen Publikationsorgan zum Druck angenommen worden sind, liegt bei dem betreffenden Publikationsorgan. Für Arbeiten, die nicht in einem anderen Organ erscheinen, liegt das Copyright bei dem jeweiligen Verfasser.

Korrespondenzadresse:

Wolfgang Bilsky, Differentielle Psychologie und Persönlichkeitspsychologie, Psychologisches Institut IV der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Fliednerstr. 21, 48149 Münster, Tel. 0251-83-34198, Fax 0251-83-31343; email: bisek@psy.uni-muenster.de

Value Structure at an Early Age

Maike Bubeck and Wolfgang Bilsky

Abstract

Past research with adult subjects has provided considerable evidence for the validity of Schwartz' (1992) theory on the structure of values. However, information about children and adolescents is scarce. The present study uses the newly developed Portraits Questionnaire (PQ-29) to test the applicability of Schwartz' values theory to this population, using a sample of 1,555 German subjects aged 10 to 17. In addition to this general research objective, the more fine-grained relation between age (used as an indicator of cognitive development) and the complexity of value structure is investigated by separately analyzing value data from different age groups. Results confirm the validity of Schwartz' theory on the structure of values in general. However, they do not show the hypothesized increase of structural complexity. Rather, value structures of 10 to 12 year olds are nearly as differentiated as those of 15 to 17 year olds.

Schwartz (1992) presented a comprehensive theory on the structure of values against a background of facet theory. According to this theory, values are conceived as transsituational concepts or beliefs about desirable goals. They are supposed to vary in importance and to serve as guiding principles in people's lives. With respect to their content, values can be distinguished on the basis of the motivational goals they express. All in all, Schwartz derives ten motivationally distinct types which are dynamically related in the form of a circumplex. This supposition applies because the behavioral implications of individual values are either compatible or incompatible with each other. For example, the pursuit of power values is compatible with achievement values: both emphasize personal success and prestige. In contrast, the pursuit of power values and universalism values may lead to psychological or social conflicts: Striving for dominance and control over people and resources is likely to obstruct actions aimed at the protection of the welfare of all people. Altogether, compatibilities and conflicts yield an overall pattern of value types as shown in Figure 1. This pattern suggests that the closer any two value types are located going around the circle, the more compatible they are; correspondingly, the more distant any two value types, the more conflicting they are.

Figure 1: Theoretical model of relations among motivational value types and two basic bipolar value dimensions

The ten value types shown in Figure 1 can be aggregated so as to form four value types of higher order. These higher order types represent opposing poles of two orthogonal dimensions. Thus, power and achievement values constitute the 'self-enhancement'-pole of the first dimension which represents the pursuit of self-interests. The opposing pole 'self-transcendence' comprises benevolence and universalism values and emphasizes concern for the welfare and interests of others. 'Openness to change' belongs to the second dimension. This pole comprises self-direction and stimulation values and emphasizes independence of thought and action and a genuine interest in everything new. It is opposed to 'conservation', which is constituted by conformity, security and tradition value types. This final pole represents the preservation of the status quo, order and self-restriction. Only hedonism values cannot be assigned unequivocally to one of the higher order value types because they share elements of both self-enhancement and openness to change. Cross-cultural studies with more than 60 adult samples have confirmed the basic structure hypothesized by Schwartz' value theory (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995).

In these studies, Schwartz and his collaborators used an instrument which was especially developed for analyzing value structures, the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS). In this questionnaire, the subjects' task is to rate the importance of 56 value concepts as guiding principles in their lives. As the wording of items is quite abstract, the task of weighing them is intellectually demanding and very complex. Value structures of children, adolescents and adults with little formal education could not be investigated, therefore. Consequently, while research was quite revealing with respect to identifying general structures, their development from childhood to adulthood could not be investigated until recently.

To overcome these shortcomings, Schwartz developed a new questionnaire which is especially suited for assessing developmental aspect of value structures. This instrument, the Portraits Questionnaire (PQ), was explicitly developed as an alternative of the SVS, covering the same domain of content. It uses a simple, more concrete language and can be easily understood, both by younger and by less educated subjects. Items are presented as short portraits of people, each representing one of the ten value types. The following portrait, for example, represents the value type conformity: "It is important to him to be polite to other people all the time. He believes he should always show respect to his parents and to older people". Respondents are asked to choose one out of six alternatives for answering the question: "How much like you is this person?". These alternatives range from "very much like me" to "not like me at all". One advantage of this response format is that it does not require a subtle understanding of rating and ranking as does the SVS. In the PQ, value types are represented by differing numbers of items, depending on their complexity. Items that represent the same value type are separated by three or more other items. There exist two separate versions of the PQ, one for male and one for female subjects aged 10 or older. In the following, we refer to an early version of this instrument, comprising 29 items (PQ-29; Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris, and Owens, 2001).

Schwartz et al. (2001) successfully validated the PQ-29, using a sample of Israeli students. Furthermore, they administered the new questionnaire to a sample of adults from South Africa. These respondents had passed through a less formal type of schooling than those usually surveyed with the SVS. The results of this second study give further evidence for the validity of the value structure postulated by Schwartz (1992). Finally, and most importantly for our study, Schwartz et al. (2001) applied the PQ-29 to a sample of 13 to 14 year old girls from Uganda. Analyses revealed a good differentiation between the four higher order value types openness to change, self-transcendence, conservation and self-enhancement. In addition, several value types representing individual interests could be distinguished; these are power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation and self-direction. Their order around the circle of value types corresponds to the sequence predicted by theory. Yet, it was neither possible to distinguish between value types constituting self-transcendence (i.e., universalism and benevolence), nor between those constituting conservation (tradition, conformity and security). In sum, these results reveal some rudimentary value structures. Yet they are less differentiated than those of the adult samples. Schwartz et al. (2001) suspect that the structure of relations among values is probably not yet fully crystallized by the age of 13.

Given these findings, *two questions arise* with respect to further studies using the PQ-29: (1) Are adolescent samples from cultures other than those analyzed by Schwartz and his colleagues likely to show *similar structures*? (2) Are developmental changes associated with age accompanied by a *progressive differentiation of value structure*? These questions are of focal interest to our own research.

As regards the *first question*, data from adult samples studied worldwide by means of the SVS give a rather clear orientation. These data point to only minor cultural differences with respect to the number of value types; furthermore, and even more important in this context, they supply strong evidence for the validity of the two basic value dimensions 'openness to change versus conservation', and 'self-transcendence versus self-enhancement' (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). Thus, when using the PQ, we would expect considerable cross-cultural similarity between adolescent samples, too. Or, more specifically, we expect that a sample of German children and adolescents will exhibit similar structures as the Ugandan sample studied by Schwartz and his colleagues. If so, *we should find the four higher order value types clearly separated and in the order predicted by Schwartz' (1992) model of value structure* (1). This is the first hypothesis to be tested in our study.

With respect to the *second question*, it is common sense to suppose that values and value structures do not exist from the very beginning but develop and differentiate in the life span, with the most dramatic changes occurring during childhood and youth (Grusec & Kuczynski, 1997). One prerequisite for this development are qualitative changes in *intellectual capacity* and in the way of *reasoning*. Obviously, there cannot be a full understanding of personal values without the ability of abstract thinking. For younger children, values are represented by concrete behaviors and situations (Fischer, 1980; Fischer & Lamborn, 1989). For an eight year old child, for example, "honesty" may mean telling the parents that s/he failed on a test in maths or confessing to have broken something. This concrete representation of values renders it difficult to compare, weigh and differentiate among them. Consequently, there will not be a well elaborated structure of values. According to developmental psychologists, the ability of abstract thinking develops during adolescence (Fischer & Lamborn, 1989). Another, however related, prerequisite for a better and differentiated understanding of personal values is *metacognition*. By means of metacognition people realize that there are psychological processes going on all the time, affecting their own as well as others' reasoning. Knowledge about the existence of these processes leads to an increased preoccupation with them, i.e., to an increased introspection about own thoughts, feelings and values (Flavell, 1977). Values in particular receive a lot of attention, as they are an essential part of the self-concept. Of course, the ability of metacognition develops further during adolescence. Finally, *experience* is another important parameter in the development of values and value structures. Certainly, there would not be any progress in value development if a person did not get an opportunity to experience different and probably conflicting social situations in life.

With respect to the *number of distinct value types*, Schwartz and Sagiv (1995) contend that, within adult samples, typically eight value types can be differentiated, with two further types intermixed. However, as children and young adolescents are supposed to be less cognitively developed and experienced in making far-reaching evaluations and decisions, we

do not expect the value system of children and young adolescents to be as well-structured and differentiated as that of adults.

Based on this reasoning and on prior findings, our second hypothesis contains two parts: As compared to adults, children and adolescents from a German sample are supposed to differentiate between *less than eight value types* (2a). Progress in age during childhood and adolescence should be accompanied by a *progressive differentiation of value types* due to an increasing cognitive capacity and a growing experience as regards evaluations and decisions with respect to one's own life (2b).

Aside from a supposedly continuous and progressive differentiation of value structure during early life, we wonder however, whether and to what extent *different experience during socialization* affect the differentiation of value structure. Of course, we are not able to control individual socialization experience in the present study. However, there is ample evidence that, even today, socialization of *boys and girls* is likely to differ in several respects. It seems reasonable, therefore, to control for sex in our structural analyses in order to get some descriptive information about differential aspects in the progressive differentiation of value structure.

Method

Instrument

For use in the present study, the English version of the Portraits Questionnaire (PQ-29) was adapted using a step-by-step procedure: First, the instrument was translated from English into German in an iterative way. Starting from a preliminary translation, three colleagues discussed alternative wordings in order to arrive at a consensual German version. Second, this version was retranslated into English in order to identify more subtle deviations in meaning from the original instrument, both with respect to denotation and connotation. This task was accomplished by two bilingual experts. Third, the German version of the PQ-29 was revised in the light of semantic differences recognized when comparing the English original with the retranslation of the instrument. This revised version of the German PQ-29 was used in the present study (see appendix). The a priori assignment of the items to the ten value types is given in Table 1.

Table 1: A priori assignment of PQ-items to basic value types

Value Type	PQ-Items
Power	09, 13
Achievement	03, 20, 27
Hedonism	10, 17
Stimulation	06, 14
Self-Direction	02, 11, 24
Universalism	05, 18, 22, 26
Benevolence	08, 15, 28
Tradition	04, 12, 23, 29
Conformity	01, 19, 25
Security	07, 16, 21

Sample

Data were collected at seven schools in two German cities during summer 1998. These schools represent six different types of school, covering a wide though not strictly representative range of age levels, intelligence and social background. On the whole, 1.555 pupils from 10 to 17 years (774 males and 781 females) participated in our study during class sessions. In lower classes teachers were allowed to read the written instruction aloud so as to guarantee a full understanding of the task. Table 2 shows the distribution within our sample according to age and sex.

Table 2: Sample split by age and sex

Age Group		1			2		3			Total
Age		10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
Sex	male	46	102	129	110	133	124	82	48	774
	female	58	130	136	127	122	134	55	19	781
Total: age		104	232	265	237	255	258	137	67	1555
Total: age group		601			492		462			1555

While hypotheses (1) and (2a) could be examined by referring to the complete data set, testing of hypothesis (2b) on a progressive differentiation of value types with age required a split into subsamples. This split was accomplished rather pragmatically by relating to a classification which has repeatedly been used in developmental psychology: Following the distinction between late childhood, early adolescence and middle adolescence (cf. Fischer, 1980; Harter, 1990; Huston & Alvarez, 1990), our subjects were split into age groups from 10

to 12, 13 to 14, and 15 to 17 years of age. Table 3 gives additional information about the split of our sample according to types of school and age groups.

Table 3: Sample split by age group and type of school

Age Group	Type of School					Berufs- schule
	Grund- schule	Haupt- schule	Realschule	Gymnasium	Gesamt- schule	
10 - 12	40			350	211	
13 - 14		59	142	291		
15 - 17		63	48	300		51
Total	40	122	190	941	211	51

Analysis

In accordance with focal studies on values research (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995), Smallest Space Analysis (SSA, cf. Shye, 1985) was applied to item intercorrelations in order to identify basic value structures as specified in our hypotheses. SSA is a nonmetric technique which depicts perceived (dis-)similarities between objects or items in multidimensional space. In this approach, each item is represented by one single point in space, with distances between points calculated in such a way as to represent the whole pattern of item intercorrelations simultaneously. Thus, the closer any two points are located in space, the more similar the respective items are supposed to be. In order to facilitate more subtle analyses of item configurations, distances are usually represented as two-dimensional projections of multidimensional scatterplots. All SSA were performed by means of the Hebrew University Data Analysis Package (Hudap 2.0).

Interpretation of each Smallest Space Analysis was performed according to the configurational verification approach (Davison, 1983; Levy, 1985). In the first place, we tried to identify the different value regions in multidimensional space as specified by Schwartz' (1992) structural theory. Schwartz has given a general rule for deciding whether a set of value points forms a contingent region that represents a distinct value type: "The region must include (1) at least 60% of the values postulated a priori to constitute that type and (2) no more than 33% of the values postulated to constitute any other single type" (Schwartz, 1992, p.22). Then, we analyzed the resulting split of items as to whether the arrangement of regions, i.e., the sequence of value types around the circle, corresponds to the theorized value structure (see Figure 1).

In order to test hypotheses (1) and (2a), respectively, one single SSA was needed, based on the item intercorrelations of the whole sample (N=1.555). With regard to hypothesis (2b), however, three separate Smallest Space Analyses had to be computed, one for each age group, i.e., for late childhood (N= 601), early adolescence (N= 492), and middle adolescence (N= 462).

Two criteria seem to be adequate for testing the assumption that structure progressively emerges with age: (1) *Number of value types to be distinguished*. Data of the 15-17 year olds

were supposed to exhibit more value types than data of the 13-14 year olds. The latter group in turn should show a higher degree of differentiation (i.e., more value types) than the 10-12 year olds. (2) *Number of misplaced items*. The younger the subsample, and the less differentiated value types were expected to be, therefore, the more misplaced items should occur.

With respect to misplacement, we took up a proposal of Schwartz, who differentiated "badly" from "slightly" misplaced items. Items are said to be "badly" misplaced, if they neither show up in one of the adjacent value regions, nor in the respective higher order value type. A slightly misplaced item may show up either in a neighboring region or in the respective higher order value type. Given this distinction, two indicators of misplacement seem applicable as criteria for progressive differentiation of value structure: (1) *The total number of all misplacements*, no matter whether the items are "badly" or "slightly" misplaced. Thus, if the second hypothesis is correct, the total number of dislocated items should decrease with age. (2) *The total number of "badly" misplaced items*. Here, too, we should find a decrease of misplacements with age if the second hypothesis is correct. When comparing both criteria, however, it should be born in mind that even in value data of adults "slightly" misplaced items are to be found. Thus they may be a less valid indicator of developmental changes than "badly" misplaced items.

In order to control for *differences between boys and girls*, we finally split all age groups according to sex and ran six separate Smallest Space Analyses with the respective subsamples.

Results

Overall structure of values

A two-dimensional Smallest Space Analysis of value items, based on the complete data set of all 1.555 children and juveniles, resulted in a coefficient of alienation $k = .13$. This coefficient indicates a satisfactory solution with respect to conventional criteria in multidimensional scaling analysis ($k \leq .15$; Borg & Groenen, 1997). More importantly, however, the two-dimensional projection of items fits the structural predictions derived from values theory; this is evident from the two analytical steps described below.

First, applying the configurational verification approach (Davison, 1983; Levy, 1985) to the two-dimensional projection of data from the whole sample, the *four higher order value types* 'self-enhancement', 'openness to change', 'self-transcendence' and 'conservation' can clearly be distinguished from each other. Only two of the items (15 and 23) are 'misplaced' in terms of our a-priori classification (see Table 1). Moreover, *the arrangement* of the higher order types is in accordance with Schwartz' (1992) value theory, too. Thus, these findings clearly support our first hypothesis (1).

Figure 2: MDS of the whole sample (N=1555)

Underlined=misplaced.

AC=achievement, PO=pow er, SE=security, CO=conformity, TR=tradition, BE=benevolence, UN=universalism, SD=self-direction, ST=stimulation, HE=hedonism

Second, the two-dimensional scatterplot was re-analyzed with respect to the more fine-grained discrimination of *basic value types* (Figure 2). Contrary to expectation, partitioning of items resulted in an excellent split again. While less than eight basic value types were supposed to show up in data from children and juveniles (hypothesis 2a), Figure 2 reveals that values can be split into nine clearly distinctive regions. Only 'stimulation' and 'hedonism' cannot be separated adequately. It should be noted, however, that the order of the types around the circle partly deviates from the theorized configuration (see Figure 1).

Progressive differentiation of basic value types with age

As regards the hypothesized differentiation of value types with age, separate analyses were run for the three age groups, as indicated before. A two-dimensional SSA for the

youngest group (i.e., the 10-12 year olds) resulted in a coefficient of alienation $k = .15$. Figure 3 shows the respective data split.

Figure 3: MDS of subjects aged 10-12 (N=601)

Underlined=misplaced.

AC=achievement, PO=pow er, SE=security, CO=conformity, TR=tradition, BE=benevolence, UN=universalism, SD=self-direction, ST=stimulation, HE=hedonism

The plot reveals eight clearly distinct value types, with the two remaining types - tradition and conformity - intermixed. The order of the value types does not fully correspond to the hypothesized value structure: Power is situated behind achievement. Moreover stimulation is situated behind self-direction and hedonism behind stimulation. Finally, benevolence and universalism have changed their places. Four of the items are misplaced, however, none of them "badly".

The SSA for the 13 to 14 year olds ($k = .14$) shows similar results (Figure 4): Eight out of ten value types can be differentiated, tradition and conformity are intermixed. Power is placed behind achievement and stimulation is placed behind self-direction. Hedonism has moved to its theorized place while the location of benevolence and universalism does not conform to

the theoretical position. Four items are misplaced, however only one of them "badly" according to the standards explained above (item 21).

Figure 4: MDS of subjects aged 13-14 (N=492)

Underlined=misplaced.

AC=achievement, PO=power, SE=security, CO=conformity, TR=tradition, BE=benevolence, UN=universalism, SD=self-direction, ST=stimulation, HE=hedonism

Finally, the SSA for the 15 to 17 year olds resulted in a coefficient $k = .16$. All ten value types could be distinguished clearly. Here again, power is placed behind achievement, and the position of universalism and benevolence deviates from the hypothesized structure. This time stimulation is located behind hedonism. Four items are misplaced, with one of them "badly" (item 21). Figure 5 summarizes the results of this analysis.

Figure 5: MDS of subjects aged 15-17 (N=462)

Underlined=misplaced.

AC=achievement, PO=power, SE=security, CO=conformity, TR=tradition, BE=benevolence, UN=universalism, SD=self-direction, ST=stimulation, HE=hedonism

To summarize the results of our analyses reported thus far, findings do not support our initial assumption that progress in age during childhood and adolescence is accompanied by a progressive differentiation of value types (hypothesis 2b).

Differences between boys and girls

While the preceding analyses served for testing our structural hypotheses, the following aimed at some preliminary information about possible gender differences in value structure. As indicated before, six SSA were run, separately for boys and girls in each age group.

Figures 6 and 7 contain the respective SSA for boys (N=277; $k=.18$) and girls (N=324; $k=.18$) of the youngest age group (10-12 years). Comparison of both plots reveals some remarkable differences. Thus, in the boys' data, tradition, conformity, security and benevolence values cannot be disentangled. Consequently, the higher value types 'self-

transcendence' and 'conservation' cannot be split either but show considerable overlap. In the girls' data, on the other hand, a clear separation of all four higher-order value types is possible. Here however, stimulation, hedonism and self-direction cannot be separated unambiguously.

Figure 6: MDS of males aged 10-12 (N=277)

Underlined=misplaced.

AC=achievement, PO=power, SE=security, CO=conformity, TR=tradition, BE=benevolence, UN=universalism, SD=self-direction, ST=stimulation, HE=hedonism

Figure 7: MDS of females aged 10-12 (N=324)

Underlined=misplaced.

AC=achievement, PO=power, SE=security, CO=conformity, TR=tradition, BE=benevolence, UN=universalism, SD=self-direction, ST=stimulation, HE=hedonism

Next, figures 8 and 9 summarize the analyses for boys (N=243; $k=.18$) and girls (N=249; $k=.16$) aged 13 to 14 years. Partitioning of values results in clear structures for both subsamples with only one slight difference: Tradition and conformity values cannot be separated in the girls' data.

Figure 8: MDS of males aged 13-14 (N=243)

Underlined=misplaced.

AC=achievement, PO=power, SE=security, CO=conformity, TR=tradition, BE=benevolence, UN=universalism, SD=self-direction, ST=stimulation, HE=hedonism

Figure 9: MDS of females aged 13-14 (N=249)

Underlined=misplaced.

AC=achievement, PO=power, SE=security, CO=conformity, TR=tradition, BE=benevolence, UN=universalism, SD=self-direction, ST=stimulation, HE=hedonism

Finally, results of the SSA for boys (N=254; $k=.17$) and girls (N=208; $k=.18$) of the oldest age group (15-17 years) are presented in Figures 10 and 11. Again, no problems arise in separating the higher-order value types. However, one peculiarity should be mentioned with respect to the boys' subsample. As can be seen from Figure 10, the 'conservation' region shows up rather blurred, with tradition, conformity and security values mixed up. This is somehow surprising, since there has been a very clear split in the younger subsample of the 13-14 year old boys.

Figure 10: MDS of males aged 15-17 (N=254)

Underlined=misplaced.

AC=achievement, PO=pow er, SE=security, CO=conformity, TR=tradition, BE=benevolence, UN=universalism, SD=self-direction, ST=stimulation, HE=hedonism

Figure 11: MDS of females aged 15-17 (N=208)

Underlined=misplaced.

AC=achievement, PO=power, SE=security, CO=conformity, TR=tradition, BE=benevolence, UN=universalism, SD=self-direction, ST=stimulation, HE=hedonism

Discussion

All in all, the present study resulted in some interesting, however partially unforeseen findings. First and in accordance with our expectations, the data presented here clearly support Schwartz' (Schwartz et al., 2001) claim that his theory is neither restricted to the use of a special instrument (i.e., the Schwartz Value Survey, SVS) nor to adults. In fact, data collected with a German form of the Portraits Questionnaire (PQ-29) reveal the same basic and higher-order value types as reported in a multitude of studies conducted with the SVS

(Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). This is true although our sample comprises only subjects from 10 to 17 years of age. Furthermore, our findings convincingly match results from other studies which used the PQ-29 for assessing value preferences in children and juveniles (Schwartz et al., 2001).

Quite unexpectedly, however, we did not find support for the hypothesized link between age and value structure. Actually, even our youngest samples show highly differentiated structures which do not deviate essentially from those found in adult samples. Of course, this is not to say that there is no systematic relationship between age and structure. In fact, values are conceived as conscious goals that vary in importance, serve as guiding principles in people's lives, and, as such, are cognitively rooted. So, there should be a pronounced relation between cognitive development and structure. However, because of the ceiling-effect found in our data, we cannot deal convincingly with this problem in the present study. Furthermore, it is unlikely that children younger than 10 will be able to work adequately with the Portraits Questionnaire, mostly because of lacking reading skills. Research will have to look for other assessment tools, therefore, to further investigate the relation between age and value structure in younger children.

Possible reasons for the advanced value structure found in our sample of children and juveniles are manifold. Significant socialization experiences in the family, in kindergarten and at school may account for an early development of individual value structure – as may the ever growing influence of media in early life. Furthermore, differences between the data from Germany and from Uganda (Schwartz et al., 2001) suggest that cultural factors should not be neglected either.

With respect to socialization experiences, it seems worth considering some tentative differences found in our study. In our youngest samples, and to a certain degree in our oldest samples, too, boys and girls exhibited structural differences, especially with respect to the 'conservation' value type. More precisely, girls showed a somewhat clearer separation of conformity, tradition and security values than boys. Although probably less important than in the past, differences in raising and educating girls and boys still exist. Given that the observed differences do not result from mere 'noise' but reflect systematic variance, paying special attention to gender differences may be a reasonable approach to arrive at a better understanding of the development and differentiation of value structure in young age. While evidence is weak, especially when considering the 13-14 year old juveniles in our study, too, analyzing gender specific differences may be 'the key' to a better understanding of the development of value structure.

References

- Borg, I. & Groenen, P. (1997). *Modern multidimensional scaling*. New York: Springer.
- Davison, M. (1983). *Multidimensional scaling*. New York: Wiley.
- Fischer, K. W. (1980). A theory of cognitive development: The control and construction of hierarchies of skills. *Psychological Review*, 87, 477-531.
- Fischer, K. W. & Lamborn, S. D. (1989). Mechanisms of variation in developmental levels: cognitive and emotional transitions during adolescence. In A. K. Ribaupierre (Ed.), *Transition mechanisms in child development: The longitudinal perspective*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Flavell, J. H. (1977). *Cognitive development*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Grusec, J. E. & Kuczynski, L. (1997). *Parenting and children's internalization of values*. New York: Wiley.
- Harter, S. (1990). Processes underlying adolescent self-concept formation. In R. Montemayor, G. R. Adams, & T. P. Gulotta (Eds.), *From childhood to adolescence: A transitional period?* Newbury: Sage.
- Huston A. C. & Alvarez, M. M. (1990). The socialization context of gender role development in early adolescence. In R. Montemayor, G. R. Adams, & T. P. Gulotta (Eds.), *From childhood to adolescence: A transitional period?* Newbury: Sage.
- Levy, S. (1985). Lawful roles of facets in social theories. In D. Canter (Ed.), *Facet theory* (pp. 59-96). New York.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M., & Owens, V. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Unpublished Manuscript*.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 92-116.
- Shye, S. (1985). Smallest space analysis. In T. Husén (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford: Pergamon.

sehr ähnlich	eher ähnlich	eher un- ähnlich	un- ähnlich	sehr un- ähnlich
-----------------	-----------------	---------------------	----------------	---------------------

1.	Es ist ihr wichtig, immer zu allen Menschen höflich zu sein.
Sie glaubt, daß man seinen Eltern und älteren Menschen gegenüber immer Respekt zeigen sollte.	O	O	O	O	O	O
2.	Es ist ihr wichtig, neue Ideen zu haben und kreativ zu sein.
Sie mag es, die Dinge auf ihre eigene Art anzugehen.	O	O	O	O	O	O
3.	Es ist ihr sehr wichtig, erfolgreich zu sein. Sie mag es, hervorragend abzuschneiden und andere Leute zu beeindrucken.	O	O	O	O	O	O
4.	Sie glaubt, daß es wichtig ist, Dinge so zu tun, wie sie es von ihrer Familie gelernt hat. Sie möchte sich nach ihren Gewohnheiten und Traditionen richten.	O	O	O	O	O	O
5.	Sie glaubt, daß es wichtig ist, daß alle Menschen auf der Welt gleich behandelt werden. Sie will Gerechtigkeit für alle, sogar für Menschen, die sie nicht kennt.	O	O	O	O	O	O
6.	Sie mag Überraschungen und sucht immer nach neuen Dingen, die sie ausprobieren kann. Sie glaubt, daß es wichtig ist, viele verschiedene Dinge in ihrem Leben zu tun.	O	O	O	O	O	O
7.	Die Sicherheit ihres Landes ist ihr sehr wichtig. Sie möchte, daß ihr Land vor allen Feinden sicher ist.	O	O	O	O	O	O
8.	Sie möchte den Menschen, die ihr nahestehen, immer helfen. Es ist ihr sehr wichtig, sich um die Menschen zu kümmern, die sie kennt und die sie mag.	O	O	O	O	O	O
9.	Sie mag es, die Führung zu übernehmen und anderen zu sagen, was sie tun sollen. Sie möchte, daß die Leute das machen, was sie ihnen sagt.	O	O	O	O	O	O
10.	Sie möchte das Leben richtig genießen. Es ist ihr wichtig, Spaß zu haben.	O	O	O	O	O	O
11.	Sie entscheidet gerne selbst, was sie tut. Es ist ihr wichtig, ihre Aktivitäten selbst planen und auswählen zu können.	O	O	O	O	O	O

WIE ÄHNLICH IST DIR DIESE PERSON?

sehr eher eher un- un- sehr un-
ähnlich ähnlich ähnlich ähnlich ähnlich ähnlich

12. Sie denkt, daß es wichtig ist, nicht mehr zu verlangen, als man hat. Sie glaubt, daß die Menschen mit dem zufrieden sein sollten, was sie haben.	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. Es ist ihr wichtig, reich zu sein. Sie möchte viel Geld und teure Sachen besitzen.	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Sie hält nach Abenteuern Ausschau und geht gerne Risiken ein. Sie möchte gerne ein aufregendes Leben führen.	0	0	0	0	0	0
15. Ehrlichkeit ist ihr sehr wichtig. Sie glaubt, daß man in jeder Situation ehrlich sein und immer die Wahrheit sagen muß.	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Es ist ihr wichtig, daß alles sauber und ordentlich ist. Sie mag es überhaupt nicht, wenn alles durcheinander ist.	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Sie sucht nach jeder Möglichkeit sich zu amüsieren. Es ist ihr wichtig, solche Dinge zu tun, die ihr Spaß machen.	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. Sie ist fest davon überzeugt, daß sich die Menschen für die Natur einsetzen sollten. Es ist ihr wichtig, die Umwelt zu schützen.	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Sie glaubt, daß man tun sollte, was einem gesagt wird. Sie meint, daß man Regeln immer befolgen sollte, auch wenn niemand aufpaßt.	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Sie mag es, wenn die Leute wissen, daß sie ihre Sache gut macht. Sie ist ehrgeizig und bereit hart zu arbeiten, um vorwärts zu kommen.	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Die Sicherheit ihrer Familie ist ihr äußerst wichtig. Sie würde alles tun, um dafür zu sorgen, daß ihre Familie immer in Sicherheit ist.	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Es ist ihr wichtig, auch solchen Menschen zuzuhören, die anders sind als sie. Sogar wenn sie nicht ihrer Meinung ist, möchte sie sie trotzdem verstehen und mit ihnen auskommen.	0	0	0	0	0	0
23. Sie mag es nicht, anzugeben oder die Aufmerksamkeit auf das zu lenken, was sie macht. Sie möchte bescheiden sein.	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Sie denkt, daß es wichtig ist, sich für vieles zu interessieren. Sie ist neugierig und versucht alles zu verstehen.	0	0	0	0	0	0

WIE AHNLICH IST DIR DIESE PERSON?

	sehr ähnlich	ähnlich	eher ähnlich	eher un- ähnlich	un- ähnlich	sehr un- ähnlich
25. Es ist ihr wichtig, sich anzupassen und sich so zu verhalten, wie alle anderen. Sie glaubt, daß sie das tun sollte, was die anderen von ihr erwarten	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. Sie glaubt, daß jeder sich dafür einsetzen sollte, daß die Menschen auf der Welt friedlich zusammenleben. Friede überall auf der Welt ist ihr wichtig.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Es ist ihr sehr wichtig, ihre Fähigkeiten unter Beweis zu stellen. Sie möchte, daß die Leute bewundern, was sie tut	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. Es ist ihr wichtig, daß ihre Freunde ihr stets vertrauen können. Sie möchte immer zu ihnen halten und ihre Interessen stets berücksichtigen.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. Es ist ihr wichtig, religiös zu sein. Sie ist immer bemüht, nach ihren religiösen Überzeugungen zu leben.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Alter: _____

Geschlecht: _____

Vielen Dank für Deine Mitarbeit!